Remarks

Claims 1-39 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 38-39 have been added. Claims 1, 10, 25, 32 and 39 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 2 is objected, but allowable. Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 2 has been presented in independent form as new claim 39. Accordingly, claim 39 is allowable.

In view of the allowability of claim 2, claims 17 and 18 dependent on claim 2 should be indicated as allowable. Indication of allowance of such claims is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 3-4, 9-11, 25, 29, 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosekrans et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Rosekrans et al. is directed to a printing system including a plurality of printers, a plurality of workstations or clients and a print server. The print server manages a plurality of print queues associated with real or virtual printers. Each print queue is further associated with

a set of printing selections (settings) that can be met by the associated printer.

Each client has a print job User interface, which holds a generic job ticket ("Interclient Job Ticket") including all printing selections, even those selections that cannot be met by any particular printer. For a specific print queue, the generic job ticket is filtered with a "print mask", which leaves only the print functions of that print queue available for selection. Print masks are stored in the server.

In Rosekrans et al., a print job submission starts by selection of a particular print queue by the client. In reaction, the client's print job User Interface combines its locally stored generic job ticket and the print mask into a job ticket dialog for the particular print queue. The operator now programs the job ticket, combines the latter with the print data file or a memory address in the server where the data file has preliminarily been stored, and sends it to the print server, which processes the job.

In clear contrast, in Applicants' embodied invention, the print job submission starts with the submission of the print data file. The server (reproduction center) stores the data file and sends a completable job ticket (e.g., "submission form description") in return to the client. After receipt of the completed job ticket from the client, the server combines the completed job ticket (submission form with the job specifications filled-in) and the stored data file, and processes the job. These features, as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 25 and 32, are completely

absent from Rosekrans et al. In Rosekrans et al., a user must first select a particular print queue and then submit a job ticket containing the data file or referring to a prestored file. Although the data files may thus be stored in the server first before sending the print job proper, storing the data file does not start a printing process.

Applicants' invention is easy for the user, because the above-discussed procedure conforms to commonly used printing in PC applications, such as Microsoft WORD, wherein simply a print command is given without having to manipulate files.

Therefore, Rosekrans et al. does not anticipate the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 25 and 32 and the rejection must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 5-7, 12, 13, 17-24, 26, 30 and 33-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosekrans et al. in view of Wake et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,861). Claims 8, 14-16 and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosekrans et al. in view of Leiman (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,796). These rejections, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, are respectively traversed.

As discussed above, Rosekrans et al. does not teach or suggest the above-noted features recited in independent claims 1, 10, 25 and 32

from which claims 5-8, 12-16, 19-30 and 33-37 depend. Furthermore, neither Wake et al. nor Leiman overcomes these sufficiencies of Rosekrans et al. since they are relied on for the features as set forth in the original dependent claims. Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 25 and 32.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in the independent claims and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejections must be withdrawn.

New Claims

As discussed above, new claim 39 corresponds to allowable claim 2 rewritten in independent form and thus is allowable.

New claim 38 further defines the invention as recited in independent claim 32 and is allowable at least for the same reasons that claim 32 is allowable as discussed here and above.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
      Raymond C. Stewart #21,066

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

RCS/EHC:sld